C

An Impartial ACCOUNT OF THE Portſmouth DISPUTATION,

With ſome Juſt Reflections on Dr. *Ruſſell* Pretended Narrative.

By { *Samuel Chandler.* *William Leigh.* *Benjamin Robinſon.*

With an *Abridgment* of thoſe Diſcourſes, that were the innocent Occaſion of that Diſputation.

Licenſed according to Order.

LONDON, Printed for *R. Smith*, near the *Royal-Exchange* in *Cornhill*, 1699.

To the Right Honourable Major General Earl, *Governour*; *Colonel* John Gibſon, *Lieutenant Governonr of His Majeſties Garriſon of* Portſmouth; *and the Worſhipful* Henry Seager, *Eſq*; *Mayor of* Portſmouth.

Honourable Sirs,

WIth Hearts full of Loyalty and Thankfulneſs, to our Rightful Soveraign King *WILLIAM*, we humbly lay theſe Papers at your Feet, who procured for us a Grant from His Majeſty, publickly to vindicate the common Cauſe of the Reformed Churches, and ſettle the wavering among us in the Belief and Practiſe of theſe Truths, which tend very much to the advancement of Piety and Religion.

We appeal to you, the Honourable Governour and Worſhipful Mayor, as to diſintereſſed Perſons and moſt proper Judges of the Truth and Impartiality of our account, which is, what was taken by the Pens of the Scribes, without any material alteration. We thankfully acknowledge your Condeſcending Goodneſs, in honouring us with your Preſence, and preventing Diſorders during the time of Diſputation. May you ſtill continue Maintainers of Juſtice and Diſcipline in your reſpective Poſts; may your Names be tranſmited to Poſterity as Glorious Reformers of a corrupt and degenerate Age, in Conformity to the Injunctions and Examples of our Gracious King: May others be excited and influenced by your Example: May theſe hopeful beginings be carried on, that there may be no prophane Swearers or Debauchees in your Streets, and Vice and Wickedneſs may be put out of Countenance, and not be able to ſhew its Head. This ſhall be the conſtant Prayer of,

Your Honours Oblig'd Servant,

SAMUEL CHANDLER.

Mr. Chandler's PROLOGUE *to the People.*

My Friends,

IT is not out of Pride or Vanity, that I now appear in this place upon this occaſion, moſt of you know, and I ſuppoſe many of you have heard, that in the Courſe of my Lecture here, I have been diſcourſing of the Principles of Religion: And having explain'd the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, did undertake to treat of the Doctrines of the Sacraments, particularly that of Baptiſm. *Thoſe that then heard me know, that I ſpeak with a great deal of Modeſty, calling thoſe who deny* Infant-Baptiſm, *by no harder Name than* Miſtaken Brethren; *when I was unavoidably engag'd in this Diſputation by a bold and confident Challenge given me, which I knew not how to refuſe, unleſs I would betray that Truth which I believe to be the Truth of the Goſpel. They themſelves not being able to anſwer the Arguments I then uſed, have cryed out,* Men of *Iſrael,* come and help; *and therefore have ſent for this Gentleman from* London. *Now I deſire that all things may be managed with the greateſt Fairneſs and Calmneſs, that we may debate of theſe matters as Chriſtians, that nothing may be done that is tumultuous or diſorderly: And, as we have the Favour of the Government both Civil and Military, ſo, that we may give them no occaſion to repent of giving this Liberty. And I hope we ſhall all of us be willing to ſubmit to the Truth, as it is revealed in the Goſpel, and lay our ſelves open to Conviction. I have no more to add, but deſire all of you to joyn with me in this my Requeſt, That God would grant that Truth may prevail.*

THE Queſtions to be diſputed of, are theſe in order:

Q. *Whether, according to the Commiſſion of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, Adult Believers only are the proper ſubjects of Baptiſm, or their Infants alſo?*

Q. 2. *Whether this Ordinance of Baptiſm, as appointed by Chriſt, is to be adminiſtred by Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming only, and not otherwiſe.* We deny and they affirm.

To the Right Honourable Major General Earl, *Governour*; *Colonel* John Gibſon, *Lieutenant Governour of His Majeſties Garriſon of* Portſmouth *and the Worſhipful* Henry Seager, *Eſq*; *Mayor of* Portſmouth.

Honourable Sirs,

WIth Hearts full of Loyalty and Thankfulneſs, to our Rightful Soveraign King *WILLIAM*, we humbly lay theſe Papers at your Feet, who procured for us a Grant from His Majeſty, publickly to vindicate the common Cauſe of the Reformed Churches, and ſettle the wavering among us in the Belief and Practiſe of theſe Truths, which tend very much to the advancement of Piety and Religion.

We appeal to you, the Honourable Governour and Worſhipful Mayor, as to diſintereſſed Perſons and moſt proper Judges of the Truth and Impartiality of our account, which is, what was taken by the Pens of the Scribes, without any material alteration. We thankfully acknowledge your Condeſcending Goodneſs, in honouring us with your Preſence, and preventing Diſorders during the time of Diſputation. May you ſtill continue Maintainers of Juſtice and Diſcipline in your reſpective Poſts; may your Names be tranſmited to Poſterity as Glorious Reformers of a corrupt and degenerate Age, in Conformity to the Injunctions and Examples of our Gracious King: May others be excited and influenced by your Example: May theſe hopeful beginings be carried on, that there may be no prophane Swearers or Debauchees in your Streets, and Vice and Wickedneſs may be put out of Countenance, and not be able to ſhew its Head. This ſhall be the conſtant Prayer of,

Your Honours Oblig'd Servant,

SAMUEL CHANDLER.

Mr. Chandler's PROLOGUE *to the People.*

My Friends,

IT is not out of Pride or Vanity, that I now appear in this place upon this occaſion, moſt of you know, and I ſuppoſe many of you have heard, that in the Courſe of my Lecture here, I have been diſcourſing of the Principles of Religion: And having explain'd the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, did undertake to treat of the Doctrines of the Sacraments, particularly that of Baptiſm. *Thoſe that then heard me know, that I ſpeak with a great deal of Modeſty, calling thoſe who deny* Infant-Baptiſm, *by no harder Name than* Miſtaken Brethren; *when I was unavoidably engag'd in this Diſputation by a bold and confident Challenge given me, which I knew not how to refuſe, unleſs I would betray that Truth which I believe to be the Truth of the Goſpel. They themſelves not being able to anſwer the Arguments I then uſed, have cryed out,* Men of *Iſrael,* come and help; *and therefore have ſent for this Gentleman from* London. *Now I deſire that all things may be managed with the greateſt Fairneſs and Calmneſs, that we may debate of theſe matters as Chriſtians, that nothing may be done that is tumultuous or diſorderly: And, as we have the Favour of the Government both Civil and Military, ſo, that we may give them no occaſion to repent of giving this Liberty. And I hope we ſhall all of us be willing to ſubmit to the Truth, as it is revealed in the Goſpel, and lay our ſelves open to Conviction. I have no more to add, but deſire all of you to joyn with me in this my Requeſt, That God would grant that Truth may prevail.*

THE Queſtions to be diſputed of, are theſe in order:

Q. *Whether, according to the Commiſſion of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, Adult Believers only are the proper ſubjects of Baptiſm, or their Infants alſo?*

Q. 2. *Whether this Ordinance of Baptiſm, as appointed by Chriſt, is to be adminiſtred by Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming only, and not otherwiſe.* We deny and they affirm.

Ruſſel. I do ſuppoſe it will be neceſſary to underſtand how much of this, that we affirm.—Mr. *Chandler* owns that we may not diſpute about thoſe things wherein we are agreed; whether you do own that Adult Believers are the proper ſubjects of Baptiſm.

Chand. If they were not Baptized in Infancy, they ought to be ſo at Age.

Ruſ. You do ſuppoſe then, that they are to be Baptized by vertue of ſome Commiſſion, and that Commiſſion of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt—*Chandler.* Yes.——*Ruſſ.* Then with reſpect to the firſt Queſtion, whether Adult Believers only, or whether Infants alſo may be admitted to Baptiſm? And I ſuppoſe you do expect that I ſhould be Opponent—*Chand.* Yes, that was agreed.—*Ruſſel.* Well then, I ſhall endeavour (God aſſiſting) to prove that *Infants are not according to Chriſt's Commiſſion the proper ſubjects of Baptiſm.*—*Argument*; If Chriſt hath no where required any of his Miniſters to Baptize Infants, then the Baptiſm of Infants is not according to the Commiſſion of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.—But Chriſt hath no where required any of his Miniſters, &c. Ergo.—*Chand.* I diſtinguiſh here upon your Anticedent, if you mean by Chriſt's requiring, his requiring Infants expreſly, and by Name, there is no need of it. But if by requiring you mean either Expreſly, or by juſt Conſequence, then I deny your Minor.—*Ruſ.* Then you ſuppoſe that Chriſt hath no where required it.—*Chand.* No, diſtinguiſh between Expreſs Words and good Conſequential Proofs.—*Ruſ.* It's neceſſary the People ſhould know what Mr. *Chandler* means, and therefore—*Robinſon.* It's fit indeed they ſhould know what he means; but it's alſo fit he ſhould Explain his own Meaning. You muſt not be permitted to explain Mr. *Chandler*'s meaning in your own words. Your buſineſs is to prove what he denys.——*Ruſ.* I do hope Gentlemen, that you will not thus break in upon us.—*Robinſon.* I do ſtand here on purpoſe to prevent Irregularities in the Diſputants.——*Leigh.* This Gentleman is our Moderator—*Ruſ.* Pray what is your Name?—*Rob.* My Name is *Robinſon.* *Ruſ.* Now if you will be ſilent, and Mr. *Chandler* be pleaſed to tell me what part of my Argument he denys, I ſhall proceed

ced in defence of it.—*Chand.* Repeat your Argument then. *Ruſ.* If Chriſt hath no where required any of his Miniſters to Baptize Infants, then the Baptiſm of Infants is not according to the Commiſſion of our Lord, *&c.* But Chriſt hath no where required, *&c.* Ergo.—*Chand.* Here I ſay as to the Major: If you mean by Requiring, Chriſt expreſly requiring in ſo many words, that Infants ſhall be Baptized, then I deny the Conſequence, but if you mean that by genuine Conſequence it cannot be drawn from Scripture, I deny your Minor.—*Ruſ.* The Term is very lax. I do not ſay, that he hath no where commanded it, but no where required it; If it be any where required its enough: give a direct Anſwer.—*Leigh.* Will you allow good Scripture-Conſequence to be proof in the caſe; or do you expect Scripture-words expreſly, let us not diſpute in the dark. Gentlemen, you that are Notaries, pray obſerve how ambiguouſly Mr. *Ruſſil* expreſſeth himſelf; He will not ſay whether he'll allow juſt Scripture Conſequence for ſufficient proof.—*Ruſ.* I think I give my ſenſe in as plain words as I can.—*Leigh.* Will you have it in Expreſs Words or good Conſequence.—*Williams.* No reaſon for ſuch a diſtinction, becauſe our Brother hath ſaid any way.—*Ruſ.* It is all one to me, ſo you prove the thing any way.—*Chand.* I deny your Minor.—*Ruſ.* I prove it thus, Only I would let the People know what you ſay, *viz.* That Chriſt hath ſomewhere required his Miniſters to Baptize Infants.—☞*Note, the Word is again altred from any way to ſomewhere.*—*Leigh.* Either expreſly, or by juſt conſequence—*Ruſ.* If Chriſt hath any where required any of his Miniſters to Baptize Infants, then it is ſomewhere ſo recorded in the Holy Scriptures. Therefore.—*Chand.* This I anſwer by diſtinguiſhing again; If you mean by being ſo recorded in holy Scripture, it being there in ſo many expreſs words, then I deny your Conſequence: But if you mean that it's not good conſequence, I deny your Minor again.—*Ruſ.* Let us not confound the People with ſo many diſtictions, bu plainly deny what part you pleaſe.*—*Leigh.* will make it appear that there is that recorded in Scripture, which by juſt conſequence will prove

*The Dr. now ſeems not willing again to allow of Scripture conſequence.

prove what you deny.——*Ruſ.* If you can prove it ſo recoreed, it is enough.--*Rob.* Pray Mr. *Leigh*, Mr. *Ruſſel* muſt prove that it is not ſo recorded: This is what lies upon you Sir.——*Ruſ.* I would know what part Mr. *Chandler* denys.——Mr. *Chand.* I deny the minor.——*Leigh.* Offer him the Commiſſion, *viz.* All Nations.——*Rob.* No reaſon for it to be allow'd; But if Mr. *Chandler* is pleaſed to take the part of an Opponent upon him, now he may.——I ſuppoſe Mr. *Ruſſel* you muſt needs know, ſince you have ſo often engaged in ſuch work as this, that according to all rules of Logick, you ought to prove the Negative. You do univerſally affirm this Propoſition, tho' in form it runs Negatively, that no Perſon can give one Inſtance in any Record of holy Scripture from whence we are obliged to Baptize Infants: Now how do you prove this? It lies upon you to prove it, otherwiſe we muſt ſuppoſe Mr. *Ruſſel* is a confident Man, and aſſerts what he cannot prove.——*Williams.* Mr. Moderator keep your place.——*Rob.* Sir, I am in my place, I muſt not ſuffer the Diſputants to break order: Mr. *Chandler* is Reſpondent, and you are Opponents, and therefore keep your place.--*Ruſ.* I would take notice of one thing. Mr. *Chandler* hath Preached to the People, that there is a plain Command for Infant-Baptiſm in Scripture, and I argue upon him to give but one Inſtance, and you will not ſuffer him to do it.--*Leigh.* Its not Mr. *Chandler's* Sermon, but the Queſtion, which we now argue upon——*Ruſ.* Thoſe who have made ſuch a noiſe about this Practiſe, ought to bring ſome colourable proof for it. But not one Inſtance hath Mr. *Chandler* given.——*Rob.* You are not now to call upon him for proof, you having undertaken to prove the contrary. Mr *Chandler* give an Anſwer he denys your Aſſertion, and therefore you muſt prove it, and not ſit down and ſay, Do you prove the contrary, or elſe I'll take it. But if you carry this Argument, it is time to proceed to another.——*Ruſ.* So I deſign if there be no Anſwer given.——*Chan.* Here is an Anſwer, I deny the Minor.——*Ruſ.* I have prov'd it according to the judgment of all preſent.——*Rob.* If you will change ſides, you may.——*Ruſ.* This is no changing ſides, for I do not deſign to quit the Opponency, only let him bring an Inſtance. *Leigh.* Here's a Gentleman that underſtands the Rules of Diſputation. I deſire Sir, whether Mr. *Ruſſel* be not obliged to prove the Negative he hath aſſerted?——Dr. *Smith.* According to the rules of Diſputation. *Negantis non eſt probare.*——*Ruſ.* Well what muſt I do?——*Rob.* Sir you are to prove your Propoſition.——*Ruſ.* How do you mean prove, the whole Scripture proves it, the ſilence in this matter is proof——*Rob.* If you can proceed no farther upon this, then its time you go on.——*Argu.* 2. *Ruſ.* If Infants are not capable to be made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men, then they cannot poſſibly be the ſubjects of Baptiſm intended in Chriſt's Commiſſion, but they are not capable to be made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men, *Ergo*, &c. *Chand.* Well then. As to your Major, that they that are not capable by the Miniſtry of Men, are not capable of ſubjects of Baptiſm: Diſtinguiſh between Compleat and Incompleat Diſciples.——*Ruſ.* What doth he mean by Denying my Major?——*Rob.* Mr. *Chandler* diſtinguiſheth between Compleat and Incompleat Diſciples: If you mean Compleat Diſciples, he denys the Major. If you mean Incompleat, he denys the Minor.

Minor.——*Ruſ.* I ſpeak of their being actually capable of being made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men —*Chand.* I deny that thoſe that are capable of being made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men in your ſenſe, are the only ſubjects of Baptiſm; That's what you are to prove.—*Ruſ.* Our Saviour hath joined Diſcipling and Baptizing together, they are firſt commanded to make Diſciples, and then to Baptize them, therefore I ſay, if Infants are not capable of being made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men, they are not according to this Commiſſion to be Baptized.—— *Chand.* Prove that.—— *Ruſ.* If Infants have no knowledge between good and evil, then they are not capable to be made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men. —— *Chand.* Here you trick all this while I require you to prove that theſe ought not to be Baptized, becauſe not capable of inſtruction by the Miniſtry of Men.—*Ruſ.* You will own they have no knowledge, yet ſtill they are capable of being made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men.—— *Chand.* You will not allow the diſtinction of compleat or incompleat Diſciples, nor yet ſhew it to be Groundleſs.—*Ruſ.* Fix upon ſomething.—— *Chand.* I told you before, If in your Argument by Diſciples, you mean incompleat ones, I deny your Minor, but if compleat ones, I deny the conſequence of your Major.—— *Ruſ.* Have Infants any knowledge.—— *Chand.* No, not in actual exerciſe.—*Ruſ.* If the Goſpel was appointed to inform Men what is Good, and what is Evil, and Infants have no knowledge to diſcern between either, then Infants are not capable of being made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men.—*Leigh.* You ought to add (incompleat).—— *Ruſ.* What doth he mean by incompleat Diſciples. You forget we are ſpeaking according to the Commiſſion. *Chand.* I don't.—— But a compleat Diſciple is one actually capable of Learning, an incompleat is one given up in order to Learn. And we appeal to the whole Auditory, whether or no a Child of two Years old, devoted to Learning by the Parents, and acceptation of the Maſter, is not juſtly Man imperfect ſenſe, deem'd a Scholar.—— *Ruſ.* Infants Scholars. Very mean ones indeed, not capable of Learning one Word.—*Leigh.* Here is a Gentleman who teaches School.—Sir I would fain know whether no one may be accounted a Scholar, but he that is actually capable of Learning.—— Mr. *Ridge* School-Maſter. I take all to be Diſciples in my School, provided Enterance Money be paid, whither they Learn or not.——*Here followed a General Laughter.*—— *Ruſ.* I muſt appeal to theſe Honourable Perſons, whither I did not tell Mr. *Chandler*; compleat Diſciples were ſuch as are made by the Miniſtry of Men, then whats the meaning of all this Noiſe about little Children, do you think.—— *Rob.* The conſequence which you would perſwaid the People that Mr. *Chandler* allows, is what he hath all along deny'd, and if you cant prove it pray proceed to another Argument.—— *Argument* 3. *Ruſ.* If the Apoſtle *Paul*, did declare all the Counſel of God, and kept back nothing that was profitable for the Church of God, and yet did never declare the Baptiſm of Infants to be an inſtitution of Chriſt, then Infant Baptiſm is not according to the Commiſſion of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt. But the Apoſtle *Paul* did declare all the Counſel of God, and kept back nothing, *&c.* And yet did never declare the Baptiſm of Infants, *&c.* Ergo.—— *Leigh.* Your Arguments is very long.

deny

I deny that the Apoſtle *Paul* never ſpoke of Infant Baptiſm, which is part of your Minor. Prove that the Apoſtle *Paul* did never declare the Baptiſm of Infants. —*Ruſ.* If the Apoſtle *Paul* hath ſo declared it, then it's ſomewhere to be found in the Writings of the New Teſtament, but it's no where to be found in the Writings of the New Teſtament Ergo &c. —*Leigh.* I deny the conſequence of your Major, for *Paul* might declare it, tho' the New Teſtament ſhould not diſcover that he did, the Text relates to the Church at *Epheſus*. And we have not the whole of the Apoſtles Sermons to them, no nor the Hundred part of them, he being among them for two Years together, ſo that he might ſpeak often of Infant Baptiſm, tho' it be not mentioned in this ſhort Epiſtle. — *Ruſ.* Is all the Counſels that the Apoſtle *Paul* wrote in the New Teſtament? Is there any Commiſſion for Infant Baptiſm, in the whole New Teſtament; I hope you'l own that the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament are the only rule to direct us how we may Serve and Glorifie God. —*Leigh.* Yes that I will. *Ruſ.* I refer you to that Scripture, and you run to a certain ſort of ſuppoſition &c. I am not talking of any Sermons that are not in the Scriptures, but of what is in the Scripture, the Words are plain. *Act.* 20. 20. *I have not kept back nothing that was profitable to you*, and verſe 27. *I have not ſhun'd to declare to you the whole counſe of God.* Ad again, 1 *Cor.* 4. 17. *He declares that his ways in Chriſt, were ſuch that he taught every where in every Church*; I do not ſuppoſe that the Apoſtle taught one Doctrine at one place, and another at another, therefore ſince it is not to be found in the Writings of the New Teſtament I hope you'l acknowledge that he never declared Infant Baptiſm. — *Leigh.* I utterly deny it, because in the Writings of the New Teſtament, are not all the Sermons that *Paul* Preached. — *Ruſ.* Suppoſing the thing granted, that *Paul's* Epiſtles are not the whole of what he Preached, that's nothing to us, *I* ſuppoſe the People will look no where elſe for it but in the Scriptures And if *Paul* declared it, then it's ſomewhere to be found in the Writings of the New Teſtament, but its no where to be found, Ergo. *Leigh.* I utterly deny the conſequence. ——*Ruſ.* Then if it be any where in the New Teſtament, Mr. *Chandler*, Mr. *Leigh*, or ſome other Perſon is able to ſhew it, but neither are able to do it. *Leigh.* I ſay it is included in (*the Words all Nations.*) Math. 28. the Commiſſion. ——*Ruſ.* I deny that the Commiſſion of Chriſt tells you that *Paul* did declare it. —— *Leigh.* I anſwer that *Paul* might have declared the Baptiſm of Infants an Hundred times over, and yet not be left on Record in his Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*.---*Ruſ.* I have neither *Epheſus* nor *Paul's* Epiſtles in my Arguments, yet you tell me of them.---Here was a general Murmuring at the Doctors Evaſions, the weakneſs whereof was obvious to the Auditory.---*Leigh.* Can it be ſuppoſed that ſix Chapters could contain all the Sermons that *Paul* Preached to them in two Years time, or dare any ſay that he never declared to them the Baptiſm of Infants, in two Years Sermons and Diſcourſe, becauſe it is not contained in this ſhort Record, and ſo I have done. ——*Ruſ.* But *I* have not done with you, the Apoſtle *Paul* is the Perſon under conſideration, and mentioned in my Argument as one that did declare the whole Counſel of God, *and* [illegible]

back nothing that was profitable for them. *---*Leigh.* The Church of the *Epheſians* pray remember that.---*Ruſ.* Yes I do, but did *Paul* ever ſpeak one Word of *Infant* Baptiſm.---*Chand.* If *Paul* did not in what is recorded to the *Epheſians*, what then? We deny the conſequence of your Argument.---*Ruſ.* I am bound to anſwer here; If there are any other Writings of *Paul* that are not contain'd in the New Teſtament, and you can produce them, then you ſay ſomething to the purpoſe.——*Chand.* It's included in the Word (all Nations.) ——*Ruſ.* I prove it againſt you, that Infants are not included in the Words (all Nations) for if Infants then all Infants would be ſo, but you only allow Infants of believing Parents.——*Chand.* You muſt prove that all Infants are excluded from the Words, (all Nation) ---- *Ruſ.* would you have me then ſhew you that there is a Limmitation in the Words, all Nations, For if I ſhew there is a limitation, I take away the force of the Argument, and this I do by Mr. *Chandlers* Confuting himſelf, ---- I deny your *Minor*, that Chriſt hath not included Infants in this Commiſſion, ---- *Leigh.* I deny your Conſequence, ---- *Ruſ.* All thoſe that are required to be Baptized by Chriſt's Commiſſion are Diſciples, but Infants are not capable to be made Diſciples therefore, *&c.* ---- *Leigh.* I Deny your whole Argument, and firſt your Major. ---- *Ruſ.* If there are no other Expreſſed in Chriſts Commiſſion, then my Major is true, ---- *Leigh.* They are imply'd, you know you allow'd good Conſequences, but juſt now, ---- *Ruſ.* If there be an Expreſs Command for Baptizing of ſome Perſons in Chriſt Commiſſion, and none for the Baptizing Infants: then Infants are not at all intended in Chriſt Commiſion. But *&c.* Therefore *&c.* ---- *Leigh.* Firſt I deny the ſequel of your Major, and then I deny the Minor, ---- *Ruſ.* It ſeems very ſtrange that you do deny this, and I will endeavour to prove it; Here is an Expreſs Command for ſome Perſons to be Baptiz'd, but now for the Baptizing of Infants, is it not a neceſſary conſequence then that they are not included in the Commiſſion.---*Leigh.* I deny both parts and firſt your Major.---*Williams.* I will prove it in *Mark* 16. laſt Verſ. He that belives and is Baptized, *&c.* Hence I argue that Belivers are the only Subjects of Baptiſm.---*Leigh.* To this I anſwer, if previous actual Believing be made Univerſally neceſſary to Baptiſm, it is much more ſo to Salvation, and conſequently no *Infant* can be ſaved. For the following Words are; *He that believth not ſhall be Damn'd* ---*Ruſ.* We do not affirm any ſuch thing, *I* would rather ſay that all *Infants* dying in their infancy are Elect and ſo Saved, the contrary to which I believe, Mr. *Chandler* cannot prove.---*Leigh.* Yes we know your opinion about this well enough, I have your Confeſſion in my Pocket. but if you will aſſert that actual believing is neceſſary to Baptiſm, then 'tis ſo to Salvation, for it follows, *He that believeth not ſhall be Damn'd*---*Williams.* Go Diſciple all Nations unto me, Baptizing them. The word then is relative to all Nations Diſcipled. If therefore there be none but Belivers, and ſuch as are taught in the Commiſſion, then infants are not in the Commiſſion; but there are none but Believers. —— *Leigh.* I deny your Minor. —— *Will.* If Infants are not capable of being taught, then they are no Diſciples; but they are not, *&c.* *Leigh.* I deny it.---*Wi*

* *Who doubts this, and what is this to the purpoſe.*

I say if Infants are not the Subjects in the Commission, neither are capable of being taught, then they are not the Subjects of Baptism.---*Leigh.* I deny that they are not the Subjects, and the Greek and signifies to make Disciples, I deny that they are uncapable of being made Disciples, because not capable of Learning.---*Will.* If to be a Disciple of Christ is to be a Scholar of Christ, then Infants are uncapable of Learning, Christ can be no Disciple.---*Leigh.* I deny still the sequel of the Major.---*Will.* If he that hath Learn'd nothing is no Scholar, then because they are not capable of Learning, Jesus Christ, they are no Scholars of Christ, but *&c.* therefore *&c.*---*Leigh.* I appeal to all here present, whether they do not accouunt an incompleat Scholar, that is resign'd by the Parent, and accepted by the Master, tho' it hath not Learned any thing. And now I deny your Minor.---*Will.* Tell me where Christ's School is for teaching Infants, and who is Christ's School-Master.---*Leigh.* Jesus Christ himself is the School-Master.---*Will* 'Tis true Jesus Christ is the great School-Master, but his Ministers are appointed to make Disciples by teaching. Now you say a Child is a Disciple as soon as he goes to School ---*Leigh.* I say the resignation of the Parent, and the acceptance of the Master, constitutes the Relation.---*Will.* If he that hath been at School, and taught by his own consent, must appear to be a Scholar of Christ, by his having actually Learn'd before he was Baptized, then Infants that are entred according to your saying must not be Baptized, but he that hath been at School.---*Leigh.* I deny your consequence.---*Will.* I prove it thus. The Eunuch was content to be taught. * *Philip* teacheth him: Yet afterwards he must know whether he believed before he Baptized him, therefore Infants entred according to your saying must not be Baptized, because they are not content to be taught, *&c.* And *Erasmus*, tho' he was none of the best Men. Yet he was accounted one of the best of Scholars in his Days, he reads it, when they have Learn'd dip thou them.---*Leigh.* Here are two things this old Gentleman argues from, the first is the instance of the Eunuch, the second is the Authority of *Erasmus.*---*Will.* Not from his Authority but Judgment.---*Rob.* Did *Erasmus* write in *English*? You say you do not understand Latin.---*Will.* In *English.*---Here the People break out into a great Laughter.---*Leigh.* Well the Eunuch was a Proselite of the Gate and a grown Person, and therefore *Philip* deals with him as such according to the *Jewish* Law. And because *Philip* requires of him a Profession of his Faith, suppose he had had an Infant in the Charoit must that be denyed Baptism, and so looked upon as the Infant of a Pagan, and be shut out of visible Church-Membership, which he enjoyed before. Did his Parents Faith deprive him of Church-membership? Then as to *Erasmus*, he was an *independant*, between a *Papist* and a *Protestant*, and many of these Gentlemen, in their great Zeal against Infant Baptism, will call it a piece of Popery, and yet can make use of the Name of an half Papist when it serves their Cause.---*Will.* If Infants are uncapable of denying themselves for Christ, then they are uncapable of being Disci-

* *He was here to prove the consequence, and he brings an instance, to prove the Antecedent and but barely asserts the consequent.*

ples

ples to Christ. But &c. Therefore &c.---*Leigh.* I deny the sequel of the Major ---*Will.* If a Disciple and a Believer be the same thing, then the sequel of the Major is true; But a Disciple and a Believer are the same thing -- *Leigh.* Why cannot Children be said in a Spiritual sense to come to Christ imputatively, as well as to come to Christ corporeally, when only brought in others Arms, coming to Christ and Believers are the same, tho' he that is brought in the Arms of the Parents, Faith cannot be actually to believe, yet imputatively he may.---*Will.* How could they come to Christ when they were brought?---*Leigh.* And yet they are expressly said to come to Christ, and may they not as well be said to be capable of Spiritual as Corporeal coming, when they are brought to him? Why cannot they come Spiritual by imputation as before.---*Will.* They cannot come Spiritually unless the actually believe; A Child cannot thus come to Christ without a sight of Christ and also of himself.---*Leigh.* I deny your Major.—*Rus.* If there be no other rule to direct us concerning Holy Baptism, than what is in the New Testament, then because it is no where there to be found. The Apostles did never Baptize any Infants but there is no other rule, &c.---*Leigh.* You are come from an Example to a Rule; I challinge you to produce one instance of any, Born of Blieving Parents Baptized at Age.---*Rus.* That's no business of ours, don't think to sham off business so. We called for your instance several times of an Infant Baptized, and you have not been able to give it.---*Leigh.* It was by the Computation of the Learned, from the Death of Christ to the Death of St. *John* the Apostle, near sixty Years, in which time many Thousands of the Children of Believing Parents became Adult.---*Rus.* The Emperour *Constantine* was Born of Christian Parents, and yet not Baptized till Adult.---*Leigh.* That was at the first Planting of the Gospel, give an instance of a grown Person, descending from believing Parents, that was Baptized when Adult, give us but this and we will give you the Cause.---*Will.* Was the Mother of our Lord a Believer.---*Leigh.* Yes.---*Will.* Well then, there's the Son of a Believer Baptized at Age. Here the Anabaptists fell a Laughing, and some cryed out it's done it's done, and for a while Mr. *Leigh* attempting several times to speak, but could not be heard.---*Leigh.* I thought our discourse had been grounded on the Commission. Was this before or after the Commission. Here the People Laughed again.---*Rob.* It is not all to the purpose.---*Rus.* Mr. *Williams*'s instance was sufficiently to the purpose for that Mr. *Leigh* called for an instance of the Child of a Believer, Baptized at grown Years. The Virgin *Mary* was a Believer.---*Rob.* Tho' Mr. *Leigh* did express himself in such general terms.---Yet he meant the Child of such a Believer as was Properly Christian; The Virgin *Mary* was undoubtedly a believing Member of the *Jewish* Church, but this is not to our purpose, for we want an instance of the Child of a Christian Parent, after Baptism was instituted by our Lord, that yet was Baptized at grown Years. The instance of our Saviour, does not agree to such a case as this is. For Christianity (as distinguished from Judaism) had not then a being, and the Virgin *Mary* was not in this sence Christian, nor was Baptism it self then instituted by our Lord, and therefore this instance can signifie nothing to

the case in hand ---*Will.* I have given an instance of the Child of a Believer Baptized at Age, give us an instance of any Infant that was Baptized ---*Leigh.* As for that, our Lord Jesus Christ is not to be imitated in that particular. ---*Ruf.* No? ---*Leigh.* If he were, then there is no Person to be Baptized till 30 Years of Age, nor Baptized at all unless Circumcised at 8 Years old. And thus their Scripture instance with their Triumph upon it vanished together. --- *Leigh.* I will prove that some Infants are Church-members in their Infancy; *Suffer little Children to come unto me, for such is the Kingdom of Heaven*, Mat. 19. 14. Hence I argue, those that belong to *i.e.* The Church militan here upon Earth are visible Church-Members. But some Infants belong to the Kingdom of Heaven ---*Will.* I deny the *Minor*, That Text proves it not.---*Leigh.* If in this place it cannot, neither signifies the laws and promises of God's Kingdom, nor the Graces by which we observe these Laws, and embrace these promises, nor the Kingdom of Glory, then it must signifie the Church Militant here on Earth, but it cannot signifie either of the former, therefore it must signifie the last, *viz.* the Church Militant.---*Will.* I deny the Minor, I say it signifies the Kingdom of Glory.---*Leigh.* By the Kingdom of Glory, you must mean either the Happiness or Subjects of the Kingdom, if it be taken for the Happiness of the Kingdom of Glory, then I ask whither little Children are the happiness of Heaven, if for the Subjects, then I ask whether of such consists the Subjects of the Kingdom of Glory, when every one as distinct from the Church Militant, imediately upon his expiring is compleat, even an Infant 3 Days old ---*Ruf.* This is very uncharitable to exclude Infants from Heaven, I would rather incline to say, and I am sure to the contrary Mr. *Leigh* cannot prove that all Infants, belonging to the Kingdom of Glory than that none do.---*Leigh.* I do not say that none who dye Infants go to the Kingdom of Glory but that none are Infants when they come there. But the Text saith, *of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*, this therefore is what I assert, that it is absurd to say that the Kingdom of Glory is any part of it, made up of weak imperfect things, as Little Infants are; and therefore that the Kingdom of Heaven here spoken of, must mean the Church-Militant here on Earth, which is impart made up of such.---Here *Mr. Russell* was silent for a considerable time.---*Ruf.* It doth appear by all that hath been said, that our Practise is allowed.---*Rob.* Nay your Practise.---*Leigh.* We do not allow your Practise unless to such as has not been Baptized.---*Will.* we agree that those that are not Baptized ought to be Baptized. You are bound to Baptize none but such as you are bound to Preach to.---I deny it.---*Ruf.* have Infant the use of Reason.---*Chand.* No.---*Ruf.* If Infants without understanding are capable of being made Disciples by the Ministry of Men, even may the Beasts of the Field; But the Beasts of the Field may &c. Therefore.---*Leigh.* I appeal to all present Is it as proper to take Pigs and Dogs to School, as little Children of a Year and half old, are these so capable of the Parents resignation, and Masters acceptation as these; If Infants might keep the Charge of the Sanctuary from a Month old and upward, they may be esteemed Believers and Disciples.---*Russell.* I wonder you maintain the

thing

thing upon such a silly Foundation.*---*Rob.* If you be of Mr. *Russell*'s mind you may turn your Children out to the Dogs, and Pigs, and Feasts of the Field. It is most unsufferable; I never heard such an expression in in my Life. But you may see what the Principalls of *Anabaptists* leads Men to.---Here the *Anabaptists* was shamefully nonpluſt. —— Mr. *Leigh* applyed himself to the Mayor and Governour in this manner: *You see they are not able to answer our first Argument, but are intirely Gravel'd*; The Rules of Disputation oblige us to go no farther in the Opponency. Yet we will be at your Command. We have Six Arguments more at Hand, if you please, we will proceed to offer them, or if you please, we will proceed to the second Question.

* *A wise answer from a silly Doctor is it not.*

Q. 2. *Whether according to Christ's Commission Baptism to be admoniſh by Dipping, Plunging, or Overwhelming only, and not otherwise it lies upon you to prove that it is by Dipping, Plunging, or Overwhelming only.*

Ruſ. The Holy Scripture shews the right way of Baptizing, but it doth not shew that Sprinkling is the way — Therefore &c. ---- *Leigh.* This Argument does not prove that it is by Dipping &c. only ---- *Rob.* conclude with words of the Question. ----- *Russel*, I understand you own it was in use in our Saviours time, ----- Here the Dr. speaks several impertinences which our Scribes thought not worth the Writing ---- *Leigh.* I deny all this —— *Rob.* Bring it into an Argument —— *Ruſ.* I say if the Holy Scripture do shew us the right way of Baptising according to Christs appointment, and yet do not show us that Sprinkling is the way of Baptizing, then Sprinkling is not the right way of Baptizing. But &c. Therefore &c. — *Rob.* There is not one Word of Sprinkling in the whole Question, it is whether it be to be administred by Dipping Plunging Overwhelming only. —— *Ruſ.* If that Baptism which is appointed by Christ and doth properly set forth his Burial and Resurrection is only right way of Baptism, then it must be perform'd by Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming only, and not otherways, therefore &c. —— *Chand.* I first deny the Consequence of the Major. And then I deny the Minor, *Ruſ.* Then you do suppose that it doth represent the Burial, and Resurrection of Christ and yet it doth not thence follow that this is the right way of Baptizing, --- My Arguments hath two parts which I shall prove, First that it doth set forth the Burial and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, Secondly, That therefore it is the only right way of Baptizing, *Romans* 6. 4. *Col.* 2. 12. Buried with Christ in Baptism, wherein also you are risen with him through Faith of the Operation of God. If there was no other Baptism instituted by Christ, nor practised by the Apostles, but what doth represent the Burial and Resurrection of Christ: Then Dipping only is the right way of Baptism. — *Chand.* I deny your Minor, — *Ruſ.* if there be any other way then you or some other Person is able to shew it, but you are not &c. — *Chand.* I can shew you another way, and that the word signifies washing and there is great probability that many had Water poured on them. — *Ruſ.* Give an instance in the new Testament that any was Baptized any other Way. — *Leigh.* we argue upon a probability, It might be otherwise than by Dipping; there is no certainty of Dipping, if you will grant that, we will go upon somewhat else, But if not you must prove that there is no probability that it might be done any other way than by Dipping — *Ruſ.* Let us

us see then what the Scripture says in this matter *Mat.* 3. 6. They
Baptized or Dipt of *John* in *Jordan*, —— *Leigh.* How doth it ap
that they were Dipt. —— *Ruf.* The Assembly. The Continuator
Pool, *Calvin* Dr. *Hammond* allow'd it, — *Chand.* That's nothing to
I defy you to prove that the word Baptize in any Text of Scripture sig
to Dip — *Ruf.* The Word is sometimes rendred Dipping in our Eng
Translations as he that Dippeth with me in the Dish, *Leigh.* Well
this would avail your cause but little, for can you suppose that he Di
himself over Head and Ears in the Ditch, Besides I find the word
signifie no more then wash. *Mark* 7. 4. 5. and so *Naaman* is said to observe the Prophets words, which was to wash, yet he went and as we read Dipped; Now since he observed the Command of the Prophet it is plain that Baptize doth not necessary signifie any thing but washing — *Ruf.* What is the word in the *Hebrew*, — *Chand.* Here is a Hebrew Bible if you'l see, — whereupon the Hebrew Bible was handed to Mr. *Rusel*, being Leusdens 2*d. Edit*, having it he kept it turning from one place to another above half a quarter of an Hour but could not find out the Book of *Daniel*, upon which the People fell a Laughing. Then the said Bible was handed to Mr. *Roberson*, who turn'd the leaf down at the place and handed it back again to Mr. *Russel*, who stood with his Spectacles on his Nose a while longer, poreing on it, but could not Read it, but he said that he understood Hebrew before Mr. *Chandler* was Born, and to satisfie the Auditory that he did so, turn'd to the first Chapter of *Genesis*, where he Read some part of a Verse or Verses, and then again turn'd to *Daniel* and could not read the words yet, after some time more Mr. *Russell* pretended to read some words, but with a low Voice.—*Chand.* We come not here Mr. *Russell* to know whether you understand Hebrew, only tell us what the word is in this place, which he could not do.—*Leigh.* We can produce several other Texts of Scripture, where Baptizo cannot signifie Dipping, as where we read of the washing of Beds or Tables, the word is Baptize according to the Greek —*Ruf.* I deny it.—*Chand.* There is —*Leigh.* What wash beds or Tables by Dipping them under Water? Or must it be by pouring Water on them, *&c.* Upon the whole the application of a little Water in Baptism, especially in these cold Climates is groundless upon what Christ quotes I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice. Now it not being necessarily imply'd in Scripture, that Dipping was the an-

tient

ent practice, we say that having a fair and probable way educeable from Scripture, we must rest therein. Therefore if Dipping in cold Weather, in cold Climates, do end to the Prejudice of Persons Health, yea to endanger Life, and it be not certainly fixed in Scripture, as the only way of Administring the ordinance; we may use our own way, as in general is most agreeable to the word of God.—*Ruf.* They think, tho' they transgress a Rule, God will have Mercy and not sacrifice.—*Leigh.* No, this is not, if we observe the rule, a Moral precept will take, place of a Ritual when opposite; much more is obligatory when it is not evident, that any Ritual one doth oppose it. —— Mr. *Russell* here attempted to read several Quotations out of the Assemblies Annotati? *Pool*, Dr. *Hammon*, &c. Which had been before disown'd, and therefore the People refused to hear him, as being nothing to the purpose, however he speak to this effect. —*Ruf.* I hope the People will observe that you are forced to differ from the Reverend Assembly of Divines, *&c.*

Chand. The Bible, the Bible is our Religion.—*Rob.* Mr. *Russell* we are not ashamed to own our selves *Protestants*, with whom it is a Fundamental Principle that the greatest and best of Men are fallable, and therefore our Assent is not concluded by meer words, of one or other Name, how great soever we pay a just reference to the very worthy Names you mention'd, but we cannot think our selves obliged to believe every thing they say; If you have any solid Reasons to offer, or the clear Evidence of any Text of Scripture to determine this point, pray let us hear it before we close up the Day. Nothing being said, he applyed himself to the People, added *Robinson.* A great deal of loose discourse you have heard upon this last Question. Mr. *Russell* was oblig'd by all the laws of Disputation, to prove that according to the Commission of our Lord's Baptism, was to be administred by Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming and no otherwise, some attempts he made towards it, of the Weakness of which I doubt not but you are all sencible; And therefore (which yet they were not obliged to) Mr. *Chandler* and Mr. *Leigh* undertook to prove that it was not necessarily to be so administred. For the clearing of which they have manifested, that the word Baptizo in the Greek as well as in the Hebrew, do not necessarily signifie any thing more than only to Wash, or to apply

Water to a Perſon, without determining whether
be by Dipping a Perſon in Water, or pouring Wat
him, or any other way ſo that Water be applyed,
that can neceſſarily be concluded from the Words.
this they have given clear evidence, both from th
Teſtament and from the New.

And now upon the whole, we are willing to refe
your Judgments, whether you be perſwaded to ac
own Baptiſm a Nullity, becauſe it hath not been ad
ſtred in the way of theſe Perſons. If you can withou
ſolid reaſon, or without the evidence of one ſingle T
Scripture be ſatisfied, you may then take what ou
verſaries have ſaid for ſatisfaction. But ſince it hath
fully prov'd, that Chriſt hath only required that Perſo
ſolemnly entered into his Church by Baptizing, or W
ing them in the Name of the Father and Son, and S
and hath not determined, ſo far as doth appear, wh
this Waſhing ſhall be perform'd this way or that, w
willing I ſay, to refer it to the Judgment of you all,
ther our way of Adminiſtration be not the moſt co
dious.

We ſhall purpoſely wave the falſhoods in the Nar
it ſelf, becauſe our own account doth ſufficiently m
them, we ſhall only add, that the Concluſion of the
it ſelf is as falſe as the reſt, for he ſays pag. 59. 60.
God was pleas'd to make the hearing of the Diſpute of
uſe to ſeveral Perſons, that they were fully convinc'd, a
in few Days after ſubmit themſelves to be Dipt in W
Whereas we can hear of no unprejudiced Perſons, wh
any way inclin'd towards Anabaptiſm, by any thing
was offer'd in the Diſputation. And we challinge th
Name us one Perſon ſo convinc'd. Thoſe that were fi
their Prejudices, might perhaps take their weak Argu
and triffling Anſwers for ſufficient confutation of
Baptiſm. But we provoke them to Name one unpre
Perſon that did ſo. And do offer for one ſuch Perſ
nam'd by them, we will if they demand it, tell them
Names of ſeveral who did ſtrongly incline to Anabaptiſm
fore, who by that Diſputation, were ſet right and
ſatisfied, that the Anabaptiſt cauſe doth reſt on weak
ſcriptual Principals, how loudly ſoever they prete
Scripture.

FINIS.